

From: Peter Liesenfelt
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/28/02 7:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The proposed settlement between the DOJ and Microsoft is grossly insufficient in either penalizing Microsoft for the antitrust issues they have been found guilty of or to provide sufficient protection against further actions by Microsoft. As I understand it (not being an expert in anti-trust litigation) precedents have been established that have identified the standards for monopoly remedies to be of the nature of denying the defendant gains from their illegal acts, protecting against abuses in the future or eliminate the monopoly. The proposed settlement by the DOJ does none of these three things.

As a citizen of the United States I have seen the following occur to my 'practical freedom of choice': My options for a personal computer operating systems has been reduced to one, Microsoft Windows. My options for application software (word processing and spreadsheets) have been reduced to Microsoft Word and Microsoft Excel. My option for Internet browsing is practically eliminated to one, Microsoft Explorer. I DO NOT want to have my choices of Internet hosts to be reduced to one, an Internet connection to one, an Internet media provider to one or an Internet news service to one. This is the path that Microsoft is going toward, to monopolize computing. See Microsoft for what it is, based on their previous actions as to where they are going.

Recently, when Microsoft was planning the release of the Windows XP operating system decided to leave out a function to Explorer that was called 'smart tags'. This function would have allowed Microsoft to essentially 'override' the content of internet pages and supplement the content with content that Microsoft desired, essentially censoring internet content. Do we want a company that has demonstrated that it abuses its monopoly position in personal computer operating systems to have this amount of power? Do we trust that they will not abuse this type of power? I think not, I hope not, I hope the United States aggressive sees to it that it will not occur.

Recently I had a problem with my Windows 2000 Professional system and had to use a backup (much older) pc to try to access Microsoft's Internet site to help determine the problem. But I found out that since it was a machine that had Netscape as a browser that Microsoft prevented me from viewing the information. This is only one example of where Microsoft dictates terms to its customers something that you would expect it would want to serve. Any justifications to such actions is only to further their goals to maintain or increase their monopoly, not to serve their users, not to serve the public's best interest. As an extremely knowledgeable computer user I find Microsoft's tactics to not be in the user's interest, only in their corporate interest. I am not

against corporate America, in fact I am a strong proponent of it, but monopolies that abuse their power must be held accountable.

I could, if need be, help architect a remedy to this case. Do I think Microsoft has to be broken up? No. I believe that Microsoft will never agree to a remedy that addresses the precedents that have been established for antitrust remedies. I strongly urge Judge Kollar-Kotelly to not accept the proposed settlement. I fear that the DOJ under the Bush administration will not seek remedies that are sufficient in depth or breath to prevent future abuses by Microsoft and that Judge Kollar-Kotelly will need to independently determine a course of remedies that will.

Peter Liesenfelt
119 Gladys Avenue
Mountain View, CA 94043